REMARKS

Claims 1-34 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-34 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 3, 25, 27, 28, and 34 have been amended as shown above.

Claims 1-34 remain pending in this application.

Reconsideration and full allowance of Claims 1-34 are respectfully requested.

I. OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION

The Office Action objects to an informality in the Abstract. The Applicants have amended the Abstract to correct the noted informality. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

II. OBJECTION TO CLAIMS

The Office Action objects to an informality in Claim 25. The Applicants have amended Claim 25 to correct the noted informality. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the claims.

III. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-6, 8-10, 13, 14, 16-19, 22-24, 27, 29, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by European Patent Document EP 0952737A2 by Chen et al. ("*Chen*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. (*MPEP § 2131; In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990)*). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. (*MPEP § 2131; In re Donohue, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985)*).

Regarding Claim 1, *Chen* recites a system that uses a profile identifying interests of a viewer to control selection of one or more segments of television programs. (*Abstract*). The profile identifies categories of interest (news, sports, weather), types of information (statistics, scores, financial), or specific information (people, places, things). (*Col. 11, Lines 2-5*). The system uses the profile to select television programs or segments of television programs and provides the selected programs/segments to a television or user device. (*Col. 11, Line 40 – Col. 12, Line 5*).

Chen simply recites a system that uses profiles to select television programs or segments of television programs. More specifically, *Chen* recites a system that receives television programs, selects particular programs or segments of programs, and outputs the selected programs/segments. *Chen* lacks any mention of receiving television programs, identifying a target person in the programs, and then automatically retrieving additional information about the person (where the additional information is separate from the television programs). As a result, *Chen* fails to anticipate a processor that searches "content" from a "first external source" to "identify [a] targeted person" and that uses "known relationships in [a] knowledge base to retrieve information that is separate from the content and related to the targeted person" as recited in Claim 1.

Chen does recite that a viewer can retrieve information from a web site. (*Col. 15, Lines 13-28*). However, *Chen* clearly requires the user to either type a URL using a keyboard or select a URL displayed on a television or user device. Neither mechanism anticipates a processor that uses "known relationships in [a] knowledge base" to "retrieve information ... related to [a] targeted person" as recited in Claim 1.

For these reasons, *Chen* fails to anticipate the Applicants' invention as recited in Claim 1 (and its dependent claims).

Claim 27 recites analyzing a "video channel" from a "first external source" to spot a "targeted person in a program," scanning "additional channels from the first external source for information related to the targeted person," and searching a "second external source to retrieve further information related to the targeted person." As described above, *Chen* simply receives television programs, selects programs and segments, and provides the selected programs and segments. *Chen* lacks any mention of identifying information "related to [a] targeted person" spotted in a program in both "channels" from a "first external source" and from a "second external source separate from the first external source" as recited in Claim 27.

For these reasons, *Chen* fails to anticipate the Applicants' invention as recited in Claim 27 (and its dependent claims).

Claim 34 recites receiving "first content data," analyzing the first content data to "extract information relevant to [a] request" from a user, and analyzing "second content data that is separate from the first content data to extract additional information relevant to the request." As described above, *Chen* simply receives television programs, selects programs and segments, and provides the

selected programs and segments. *Chen* lacks any mention of extracting information for a request from "first content data" and from "second content data that is separate from the first content data" as recited in Claim 34.

For these reasons, *Chen* fails to anticipate the Applicants' invention as recited in Claim 34.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejection and full allowance of Claims 1-6, 8-10, 13, 14, 16-19, 22-24, 27, 29, and 34.

IV. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects Claims 7, 20, 21, 28, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,629 to Basu et al. ("*Basu*"). The Office Action rejects Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen* in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0014422 to Notargiacomo et al. ("*Notargiacomo*"). The Office Action rejects Claims 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen* in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0061610 to Errico ("*Errico*"). The Office Action rejects Claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen* in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0151992 to Hoffberg et al. ("*Hoffberg*"). The Office Action rejects Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen*, *Basu*, and *Notargiacomo*. The Office Action rejects Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen*, *Basu*, and *Errico*. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In *ex parte* examination of patent applications, the Patent Office bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. (*MPEP § 2142; In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 1262,*

23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992)). The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention is always upon the Patent Office. (*MPEP § 2142; In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 U.S.P.Q. 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984)*). Only when a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established does the burden shift to the applicant to produce evidence of nonobviousness. (*MPEP § 2142; In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993)*). If the Patent Office does not produce a *prima facie* case of unpatentability, then without more the applicant is entitled to grant of a patent. (*In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); In re Grabiak, 769 F.2d 729, 733, 226 U.S.P.Q. 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1985)*).

A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. (*In re Bell, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)*). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. (*MPEP § 2142*).

Claims 7, 11, 12, 15, 20, 21, 25, and 26 depend from Claim 1. Claims 28 and 30-33 depend

from Claim 27. As described above in Section III, Claims 1 and 27 are patentable. As a result, Claims 7, 11, 12, 15, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28, and 30-33 are patentable due to their dependence from allowable base claims.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejections and full allowance of Claims 7, 11, 12, 15, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28, and 30-33.

V. CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicants assert that all pending claims in this application are in condition for allowance and respectfully request full allowance of the claims.

SUMMARY

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *wmunck@davismunck.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication (including any extension of time fees) or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: Dec 8, 2004

William A. Munck
Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 628-3600 (main number)
(972) 628-3616 (fax)
E-mail: *wmunck@davismunck.com*